Appendix 1: Changes in Insurance Status and Perforated Appendix Rates for Policy-eligible and Policy-ineligible Young Adults, Before and After the Dependent Coverage Provision. Sensitivity Analyses on Reduced Samples.

	Policy Eligible Group <sup>1</sup>		Comparison Group		Unadjusted difference	Adjusted difference	p value for between
	Before Policy <sup>2</sup>	After Policy	Before Policy	After Policy	in change between groups <sup>3</sup>	in change between groups⁴	group difference
Ages 22-25 vs Ages 26-29, Years 2006-10 vs 2011-12							
Sample (patient encounters)	20,556	18,967	7,890	7,142			
Private Insurance	51.8%	53.1%	57.1%	50.9%	7.5%	6.8%	<0.001***
Uninsured	23.9%	21.7%	20.1%	21.8%	-3.9%	-3.3%	<0.001***
Perforated Appendix Rate	17.3%	18.1%	16.9%	18.7%	-1.0%	-1.2%	0.156
Ages 19-25 vs Ages 26-34, Years 2009-10 vs 2011-12							
Sample (patient encounters)	11,834	13,192	14,637	15,959			
Private Insurance	50.6%	53.7%	56.3%	53.9%	5.5%	5.5%	<0.001***
Uninsured	22.7%	20.1%	19.8%	20.0%	-2.8%	-3.3%	<0.001***
Perforated Appendix Rate	17.6%	17.8%	18.3%	19.9%	-1.4%	-1.5%	0.047*
Ages 19-25 vs Ages 26-34, Years 2006-10 vs 2011-12, Unweighted model⁵							
Sample (patient encounters)	37,479	42,477	14,637	15,959			
Private Insurance	53.1%	53.8%	59.1%	54.1%	5.7%	5.8%	<0.001***
Uninsured	22.6%	20.0%	18.7%	19.9%	-3.8%	-3.7%	<0.001***
Perforated Appendix Rate	17.6%	17.8%	18.5%	19.8%	-1.1%	-1.5%	0.010*

**SOURCE:** National Inpatient Sample (NIS), 2006-2012. **NOTE: 1.** Policy Eligible Group defined as policy eligible young adults (ages 19-25 or 22-25), control group is similar policy ineligible young adults (ages 26-34 or 26-34); **2.** Before Policy is years 2006 to Q2 of 2010 or 2009 to Q2 of 2010, After policy is years 2011-2012; Q3 and Q4 of 2010 are used as a washout year as the policy began in September 2010; **3.** Calculated by subtracting the pre/post difference of the treatment group from the pre/post difference of the control group; **4.** Adjusted for sample variation in year, patent-factors (age, sex, race, comorbidities, community income, urban/rural status), and facility-factors (census region and teaching status); **5.** Uweighted model incorporated the NIS-based weighting variables (hospital, NIS\_stratum, and discharge weight) into the regression model to serve as a specification text to ensure results are driven by the 2012 NIS reweighting. \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001